1	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP	SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
2	David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)	Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)
	333 Main Street Armonk, NY 10504	Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice) Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)
3	Tel: (914) 749-8200	Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice)
4	dboies@bsfllp.com	1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
5	Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165	New York, NY 10019 Tel.: (212) 336-8330
3	Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No.	bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
6	238027 Erika Nyborg-Burch, CA Bar No. 342125	srabin@susmangodfrey.com
7	44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor	sshepard@susmangodfrey.com afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
8	San Francisco, CA 94104	
	Tel.: (415) 293-6800 mmao@bsfllp.com	Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
9	brichardson@bsfllp.com	Los Angeles, CA 90067
10	enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com	Tel.: (310) 789-3100
11	James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)	abonn@susmangodfrey.com
	Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)	MORGAN & MORGAN
12	100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor Miami, FL 33131	John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice) Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice)
13	Tel.: (305) 539-8400	201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
14	jlee@bsfllp.com	Tampa, FL 33602
	rbaeza@bsfllp.com	Tel.: (813) 223-5505 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
15	Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334 725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor	rmcgee@forthepeople.com
16	Los Angeles, CA 90017	Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
17	Tel.: (213) 995-5720	711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
18	alanderson@bsfllp.com	San Francisco, CA 94102 Tel: (415) 358-6913
		mram@forthepeople.com
19	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
20		CT OF CALIFORNIA
21	CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,	Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK
22	JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER	
	CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO individually and on behalf of all others	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXCLUDE PORTIONS OF
23	similarly situated,	THE REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF
24	•	KONSTANTINOS PSOUNIS
25	Plaintiffs, v.	Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
26		Date: September 27, 2022
	GOOGLE LLC, Defendant.	Time: 2:00 p.m. Location: Courtroom 1 – 4th Floor
27	Defendant.	
28		on to Exclude Portions of the Rebuttal Expert
		stantinos Psounis 64-YGR-SVK
	4.20-64-030	0T-1 0IX-0 V IX

1	Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Chasom Brown, William Byatt, Jeremy Davis, Christopher
2	Castillo, and Monique Trujillo, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated
3	("Plaintiffs") Motion to Exclude Portions of the Rebuttal Expert Report of Konstantinos
4	Psounis. On June 7, 2022, Defendant Google LLC ("Google") served the expert report of Dr
5	Psounis. In this report, Dr. Psounis provided 13 opinions purporting to rebut the opinions
6	rendered by two experts proffered by Plaintiffs: Mr. Hochman and Mr. Schneier. On August 23
7	2022, Plaintiffs filed the present motion to exclude Psounis opinions 1, 3, and 7-10, all of which
8	attempt to rebut opinions proffered by Mr. Hochman.
9	Upon full consideration of this matter, the Court holds that opinions 1, 3, and 7-10 of Dr
10	Psounis's report should be excluded. Google has failed to sustain its burden to show these
11	opinions are the product of "reliable principles and methods" that have been "reliably applied."
12	Fed. R. Evid. 702; see also Shelton v. Air & Liquid Sys. Corp., 2022 WL 2712381, at *1 (N.D.
13	Cal. July 11, 2022) (Gonzalez, Rogers, J.) ("The proponent of expert testimony has the burder
14	of proving admissibility in accordance with Rule 702."). In preparing his opening expert report
15	Mr. Hochman ran tests on over
16	. Hochman Report App. G ¶ 25. In contrast, Dr. Psounis ran no tests at all
1.0000000000	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly
16	
16 17	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab
16 17 18	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab
16 17 18 19	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. <i>See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig.</i> , 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing
16 17 18 19 20	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. <i>See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig.</i> , 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); <i>see also Young v. Cree Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 292549
16 17 18 19 20 21	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. <i>See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig.</i> , 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); <i>see also Young v. Cree Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 292549 at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (excluding as unreliable testimony from
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig., 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); see also Young v. Cree Inc., 2021 WL 292549 at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (excluding as unreliable testimony from expert that merely "grouped together similar Cree LED bulbs, tested a fraction of them, and then
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig., 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); see also Young v. Cree Inc., 2021 WL 292549 at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (excluding as unreliable testimony from expert that merely "grouped together similar Cree LED bulbs, tested a fraction of them, and ther extrapolated his conclusions across a wide array of Cree products.").
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig., 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); see also Young v. Cree Inc., 2021 WL 292549 at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (excluding as unreliable testimony from expert that merely "grouped together similar Cree LED bulbs, tested a fraction of them, and ther extrapolated his conclusions across a wide array of Cree products.").
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	and only reviewed data from one of the relevant data sources, and then improperly extrapolated based on that narrow analysis. This is insufficient. See In re Roundup Prod. Liab Litig., 390 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("[U]njustified extrapolations from existing data can require the Court to exclude an expert."); see also Young v. Cree Inc., 2021 WL 292549 at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (excluding as unreliable testimony from expert that merely "grouped together similar Cree LED bulbs, tested a fraction of them, and ther extrapolated his conclusions across a wide array of Cree products.").

1	
2	
3	
4	Finally, as Dr. Psounis did not even attempt to disprove the Hochman data analysis he
5	purports to rebut, his opinions fall outside the scope of proper rebuttal testimony and are,
6	therefore, untimely. See Dkt. 465; People v. Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., 159 F. Supp.
7	3d 1182, 1192-93 (S.D. Cal. 2016) (excluding as untimely expert testimony that failed to
8	constitute proper rebuttal report).
9	
10	It is therefore
11	ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED:
12	1. Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Portions of the Rebuttal Expert Report
13	of Konstantinos Psounis.
14	
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.
16	
17	Dated: The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
18	United States District Judge
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	3 [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Portions of the Rebuttal Expert
20	Report of Konstantinos Psounis 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK